

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application : Panin G.

Serial No. : 10/579,814 Confirmation No. 5953

Art Unit : 1619

Filed : October 13, 2006

Examiner : Mattison, L. K

For : **COSMETIC AND/OR DERMATOLOGICAL  
COMPOSITIONS CONTAINING POLYPHENOLS  
STABILIZED BY PERFLUOROPOLYETHER  
PHOSPHATES AND USE OF PERFLUOROPOLYETHER  
PHOSPHATES AS STABILIZING AGENTS FOR  
POLYPHENOLS**

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Pre-Appeal Brief**

Sir:

Applicant submits this Pre-Appeal Brief, together with a Notice of Appeal and a petition for a two month extension of time in the above-identified application. Thus, this Pre-Appeal Brief is timely filed.

## REMARKS

Claims 16-38 and 42 are the subject of Applicant's appeal. The presently claimed invention is directed to:

A cosmetic and/or dermatological composition for topical use, comprising:  
polyphenols with a suitable carrier and  
at least one perfluoropolyether phosphate for effectively stabilizing the polyphenols  
against oxidative degradation.

(*e.g.*, page 4, lines 10-17).

The Examiner has rejected claims 16, 20-21, 23 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being obvious over the combination of EP 1,074,243 to Pantini (hereinafter "Pantini") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,066,311 to Cheetam et al. (hereinafter "Cheetam"). The Examiner has also rejected the other claims over a combination of Pantini and Cheetam in further view of additional references. However, as claim 16 is the only independent claim and it has not been rejected over the additional combinations, Applicant addresses herein only the rejection over Pantini and Cheetam.

As submitted in the arguments presented in Applicant's responses of May 2, 2011 and August 14, 2009, Pantini only describes (per)fluoropolyethers as presently claimed, but with regard to emulsion stability only(*e.g.*, page 9, lines 14-19 of May 2, 2011 response and page 11, lines 3-11 and 19-20). Moreover Pantini discloses a composition with multiple purposes such as for skin protection against irritating agents, hair protection, hair treatment, skin protection against sun radiation, detergency, deodorants, after-shaves, disinfectants for external use, nail-varnish removal and make-up (*e.g.*, page 4 paragraph [0025]).

As also previously submitted, Cheetam does not provide for Applicant's invention nor makes up for Pantini's deficiencies. Specifically, Cheetam only discloses caffeic acid and derivatives in the context of sunscreen additives (*e.g.*, col. 1, lines 3-5).

Thus, for the following reasons it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Pantini with Cheetam would not have rendered obvious the claimed subject matter to one skilled in the art.

First, even where a general method that could have been applied to make the claimed product was known and within the level of skill of the ordinary artisan, the claim may nevertheless be nonobvious if the problem which had suggested use of the method had been previously unknown. *In re Omeprazole Patent Litigation*, 536 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2008). Pantini and/or Cheetam do not recognize the problem of oxidative phenols' degradation. Accordingly, their combination cannot render obvious the claimed subject matter which is directed to a composition comprising polyphenols and at least one perfluoropolyether effective for stabilizing the phenols against oxidative degradation.

Second, Pantini discloses a number of possible uses for the composition described therein. Accordingly, a person skilled in the art would not know, nor would have any motivation to add the caffeic acid described by Cheetam to a specific use of the composition disclosed by Pantini.

Moreover, Applicant submits that the Examiner's reasoning in the Advisory Action issued on May 18, 2011 is circular. The Examiner has taken the position that because Pantini explicitly teaches using sun filters in sun protective gels, an artisan would be motivated to add the caffeic acid described by Cheetam to the composition described by Pantini. However, this reasoning is flawed and incorrect.

First, as submitted above, Pantini discloses many different applications for its composition, one of which is a sun cream gel which already comprises UV filters (*e.g.*, page 10). Thus, one skilled in the art would find no motivations for adding an additional UV filter to the composition disclosed by Pantini.

Second, exactly because Pantini already discloses a sun cream with UF filter, but it also discloses other applications for its composition, one skilled in the art would not know to what to add the caffeic acid and for which purpose. Thus, for this additional reason it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Pantini and Cheetam cannot render obvious the claimed subject matter.

Third, as submitted above, the combination of cited references does not recognize the problem of oxidative phenols degradation prevented by the presence of perfluoropolyether phosphates. The fact that Pantini include perfluoropolyether in its composition in addition to UV screening substances, render the allegedly combination with Cheetam improper because based on hindsight. Since the perfluoropolyether described by Pantini has the only purpose of improving the stability of the emulsion, a person skilled in the art would not even consider adding caffeic acid to the composition of Pantini which already comprises UV screening substances of chemical or physical types as butylmethoxybenzoylmethane, octylmethoxycinnamate or titanium dioxide.

Thus, for all of these reason, it is respectfully submitted that Pantini and Cheetam cannot be combined as proposed by the Examiner to render obvious the subject matter of claim 16, 20-21, 23 and 38.

As set forth above, if an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is non-obvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As claims 17-38 and 42 all depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 16

which is not rendered obvious by the combination of Pantini and Cheetam in view of the additional references' combinations, it is respectfully submitted that claims 17-38 and 42 are also patentable over the additional references' combinations.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejection of claims 16-38 and 42 is untenable and should be overturned.

The Director is authorized to charge any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-2275.

Dated: June 21, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP

/Silvia Salvadori/

Silvia Salvadori, Reg. No. 48,265

LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP

475 Park Avenue South

New York, NY 10016

Phone: 646-783-6758

Fax: 212-661-8002

<b>PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW</b>		Docket Number (Optional) 405.1001							
<p>I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]</p> <p>on _____</p> <p>Signature _____</p> <p>Typed or printed name _____</p>		<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"><tr><td style="width: 50%; padding: 5px;">Application Number 10/579,814</td><td style="width: 50%; padding: 5px;">Filed 10/13/2006</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2" style="padding: 5px;">First Named Inventor Giorgio Panin</td></tr><tr><td style="padding: 5px;">Art Unit 1619</td><td style="padding: 5px;">Examiner Mattison, Lori K.</td></tr></table>		Application Number 10/579,814	Filed 10/13/2006	First Named Inventor Giorgio Panin		Art Unit 1619	Examiner Mattison, Lori K.
		Application Number 10/579,814	Filed 10/13/2006						
		First Named Inventor Giorgio Panin							
Art Unit 1619	Examiner Mattison, Lori K.								
<p>Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.</p> <p>This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.</p> <p>The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.</p>									
<p>I am the</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number <u>48,265</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____</p>		<p><u>/Silvia Salvadori/</u> _____ Signature</p> <p><u>Silvia Salvadori</u> _____ Typed or printed name</p> <p><u>646-783,6758</u> _____ Telephone number</p> <p><u>June 21, 2011</u> _____ Date</p>							
<p>NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.</p>									
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Total of <u>1</u> forms are submitted.</p>									

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

*If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.*

## Privacy Act Statement

The **Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579)** requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (*i.e.*, GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.